

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEBORAH WILSON,)
)
Plaintiff(s),) No. C07-3431 BZ
)
v.) **SECOND SCHEDULING ORDER**
)
COMPASS VISION INC., et al.,)
)
)
Defendant(s).)
_____)

On August 10, 2007, I issued a scheduling order setting defendants' motions to dismiss for hearing on September 19, 2007 and setting relating briefing deadlines. It appears that my August 10 order was served only by electric posting, which may explain why no opposition was received. Therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** as follows:

1. My August 10, 2007 Scheduling Order (Docket No. 17) is **VACATED**.


2. Plaintiff's oppositions to both motions to dismiss shall be filed by **Tuesday, September 18, 2007**.

3. Defendants' replies shall be filed by **Monday, September 24, 2007**.

1 4. A hearing on both motions shall be held on **Wednesday,**
2 **October 3, 2007, at 10:00 a.m.,** in Courtroom G, 15th Floor,
3 Federal Building, San Francisco, California 94102.

4 Plaintiff is further notified as follows: Defendants have
5 made motions to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the Federal
6 Rules of Civil Procedure. You must file an opposition to the
7 motion and explain why the motions should not be granted. If
8 the motions are granted, that may result in the dismissal of
9 some or all of your case or may require you to amend your
10 complaint. You are encouraged to consult the Federal Rules of
11 Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules and the Handbook for
12 Litigants Without A Lawyer. The Civil Local Rules and the
13 Handbook are both available in the Clerk's office and at the
14 Court's website at: <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/>

15 Dated: September 6, 2007

16 
17 Bernard Zimmerman
United States Magistrate Judge

18
19 G:\BZALL\BZCASES\WILSON\SCHED ORDER 2.wpd
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28